



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
097055,553	04/06/98	KAIN	J 3168-29779

BARNES & THORNBURG
11 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

PM32/0302

EXAMINER

BROWN, P	PAPER NUMBER
ART UNIT	8

3624

DATE MAILED: 03/02/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23/98 and 12/14/98

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213:

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☐ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 29-38 is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) ~~1-28~~ 1-28 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 7
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

Art Unit: 3624

1. In light of the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed before the mailing of the first office action, the previous action has been vacated in favor of the following action.

2. Claims 6-13, 15-22, 26, and 29-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 6, lines 1 and 3, the "harness-control plate" should be "harness-control panel".

In claim 8, line 4, the phrase "found to include" is awkward and should be changed to "which includes...", or the like. Note also that the phrase "adapted to face toward a child.." should define more clearly that the back plate is located adjacent a front surface of the shell, and that the child actually rests against the back plate.

Claim 13 as a whole is confusing and unclear.

In claims 15, 18, 26 and 29, the location of the "panel height locators" and the "position locator slots", relative to the other elements of the invention, has not been adequately set forth. In particular, their position relative to the guide slots and the sliding back plate, which are also mounted on the seat back, should be set forth, i.e. on the rearwardly facing surface of the seat back, or the like.

Art Unit: 3624

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burleigh et al ('601).

Figures 1-6 show structure similar to that claimed.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burleigh ('601) in view of Burleigh ('639).

Burleigh ('639) discloses a vertically movable headrest and harness-control panel 90 (figs. 5,6) that is slidably mounted on the front face of the back support portion 78, by means of grooves and support arms. In view of this suggestion, to have mounted the harness-control panel of Burleigh ('601) to the front face of the

Art Unit: 3624

back support, thereby providing adjustable lateral head support wings for the occupant, would have been well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burleigh ('601).

Burleigh (figs. 11,12) discloses a toothed locking mechanism for holding the panel in an adjusted position, and to have simply formed a plurality of teeth or "slots" on the arm member 96 which are engaged by a single tooth on the panel, would have been an obvious reversal of parts, and would have provided the structure as claimed.

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burleigh ('601) in view of Lefranc.

To have secured the ends of the shoulder straps of Burleigh to a rod member, for preventing withdrawal of the straps through the slots, would have been an obvious modification, as such is shown to be conventional by Lefranc (fig. 4).

9. Claims 25,27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burleigh ('601) in view of Burleigh ('639).

To have provided a headrest/harness-control plate on the front surface of the back of Burleigh ('601), by means of support arms and guide slots, would have been an obvious modification in view of Burleigh ('639), as set forth above.

Art Unit: 3624

10. Claims 16,18-22 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claims 29-38 are allowed.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tanaka et al and Weber et al show various features of the invention.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Brown whose telephone number is (703) 308-2103.


PETER R. BROWN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

prb
March 1, 1999